

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 10 and 12 through 16 remain in this application.  
Claim 11 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

#### **Section 2 of the Office Action**

The specification has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The specification has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Section 3 of the Office Action**

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted under separate cover and addressed to the Examiner is applicant's proposed amendment of the drawing. Specifically, in Figure 1 of the drawings as originally filed, reference number "10" and a lead line have been added.

In light of the proposed drawing amendment, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

#### **Sections 4 through 6 of the Office Action**

Claims 5, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 16 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

The claims have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 5, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 16 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Sections 7 through 18 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 through 7, 9, 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,670).

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,670).

In regard to claim 1, it is submitted that the Authier reference does not disclose, teach or suggest "each of said holder members comprising a mounting portion, said mounting portion being adapted for selectively securing the associated one of said holder members to the vehicle, said mounting portion of each of said holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle, said mounting portion being positioned substantially parallel to the associated one of said light emitting members when one of said light emitting members is received by the associated one of said holder members". The Authier reference teaches a watercraft navigation light system that fails to teach the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. The Authier reference clearly shows the mounting bracket being positioned at an angle to the light source. Therefore, it is submitted that Authier reference would not lead one to anticipate the combination of features as claimed by the applicant.

Claims 2 through 9 and 13 are dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporate the requirements of claim 1. Thus,

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

claims 2 through 9 and 13 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 11 has been cancelled.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 through 7, 9, 11 and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 8 is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Section 19 of the Office Action

Claim 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,670) in view of Slutsky (U.S. Patent 2,125,403).

In regard to claim 1, it is submitted that the combination of Authier with Slutsky is not suggested by the prior art, and even if such a combination were to be made, one would not be led to the combination of features recited in applicants' claims. In particular, the references do not disclose, teach or suggest "each of said holder members comprising a mounting portion, said mounting portion being adapted for selectively securing the associated one of said holder members to the vehicle, said mounting portion of each of said holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle, said mounting portion being positioned substantially parallel to the associated one of said light emitting members when one of said light emitting members is received by the associated one of said holder members". As discussed above, the Authier reference fails to teach the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. The Slutsky reference teaches sign unit mounting that fails to teach the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and

Appln. No. 10/700,953

Amendment dated June 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. Therefore, it is submitted that the combination of the Authier reference with the Slutsky reference would not lead one to the combination of features as claimed by the applicant.

Claim 10 is dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporates the requirements of claim 1. Thus, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

#### **Section 20 of the Office Action**

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,670) in view of Moscarillo (4,405,973).

In regard to claim 1, it is submitted that the combination of Authier with Moscarillo is not suggested by the prior art, and even if such a combination were to be made, one would not be led to the combination of features recited in applicants' claims. In particular, the references do not disclose, teach or suggest "each of said holder members comprising a mounting portion, said mounting portion being adapted for selectively securing the associated one of said holder members to the vehicle, said mounting portion of each of said holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle, said mounting portion being positioned substantially parallel to the associated one of said light emitting members when one of said light emitting members is received by the associated one of said holder members". As discussed above, the Authier reference fails to teach the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. The Moscarillo reference teaches emergency light sources that fails to teach

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. Therefore, it is submitted that the combination of the Authier reference with the Moscarillo reference would not lead one to the combination of features as claimed by the applicant.

Claim 10 is dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporates the requirements of claim 1. Thus, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Section 21 through 23 of the Office Action**

Claims 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,607) in view of Slutsky (U.S. Patent 2,125,403).

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier (U.S. Patent 5,416,670) in view of Slutsky (U.S. Patent 2,125,403) and Moscarillo (U.S. Patent 4,405,973).

In regard to claim 14, it is submitted that the combination of Authier with Slutsky and Moscarillo is not suggested by the prior art, and even if such a combination were to be made, one would not be led to the combination of features recited in applicants' claims. In particular, the references do not disclose, teach or suggest "each of said holder members comprising a mounting portion, said mounting portion being adapted for selectively securing the associated one of said holder members to the vehicle, said mounting portion of each of said holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle, said mounting portion being positioned substantially parallel to the associated one of said light emitting members when one of said light emitting members is received by the associated one of said holder

Appln. No. 10/700,953  
Amendment dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

members". As discussed above, the Authier, Slutsky and Moscarillo references fail to teach the mounting portion of each of the holder members being positioned between the associated one of the light emitting members and the vehicle and substantially parallel to the associated one of the light emitting members as claimed by the applicant. Therefore, it is submitted that the combination of the Authier reference with the Slutsky and Moscarillo references would not lead one to the combination of features as claimed by the applicant.

Claims 15 and 16 are dependent upon claim 14, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporate the requirements of claim 14. Thus, claims 15 and 16 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 14 and 16 is therefore respectfully requested.


Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 15 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By   
Robert K. Huck (Reg. No. 45,761)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931

Date: 6-8-05